MARCH MINUTES

REGIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, March 21st, 2013   1:30 PM – 3:30 PM
Location: KCOEM, Training Room

Attendance

Craig Hurley (Covington Water), Doug Luedeman (Burien Fire), Denis Uhler (Overlake Hospital), Bob Taylor (Covington Water), Bob Freitag (University of Washington), Gail Harris (Shoreline), James Kraman (Century Link Field), Jim Tritten (Valley Medical), Joe Clow (Enumclaw), Kimberly Behymer (Kent), Mike Ryan (Zone 1), Milton Guerreiro (Burien Fire), Monica Walker (KCDNR), Rick Wallace (VashonBePrepared), Sarah miller (City of Auburn), Scott Emry (Lake Washington School District), Janice Rahman (KCOEM), Barnaby Dow (KCOEM), Sam Ripley (KCOEM)

Action items to be completed by committee members by next meeting:

1. All: Consider recommendations for the "aggregate hazards" chapter
2. All: Review guiding principles/mission statement document for next meeting
3. All: Review critical facilities description document for next meeting.
4. Sam: Post Snohomish HMP link to SharePoint for review
5. Sarah: Send inundation data for Mud Mountain to Tetra Tech

Key highlights and decisions

- **Corrected February minutes**: If an individual is funded by federal money, their hours cannot be counted towards in-kind match. (Previously stated that they could use the standard volunteer rate.)
- **Corrected February minutes**: Plans can be submitted via SharePoint as well as email. (Previously stated they should be submitted by email.)
- **Overlake Hospital** is willing to host a public event for the mitigation update.
- Based on discussions, the SC determined that the **natural hazards** (not including additional technological hazards) to be addressed in the 2014 update will be:
    1. Avalanche
    2. Dam
    3. Earthquakes
    4. Flood
    5. Landslide
    6. Severe Weather (drought, extreme heat, extreme cold, winds, tornado, lightning)
    7. Severe Winter Storms (snow, blizzard, ice storms, ice jams)
    8. Tsunami

9. Volcano/Ash/Lahar
10. Fire profile to include both Urban Fire and Wildfire Sections

- Non-natural hazards can be profiled but cannot be assessed through objective standards. For that reason, a linkage procedure will be used to identify existing plans that define capabilities used to address these hazards. Committee members will vote on which non-natural hazards will be addressed at the next meeting.

MEETING OPEN

RISK ASSESSMENT UPDATE

From here on out, the steering committee will be getting monthly reports on the progress of the risk assessment. Carol Bauman from Tetra Tech will be preparing the report.

Current status:

The principal analysis tool is HAZUS, a computer mapping tool which uses spatial mapping as well as mathematical models to predict the extent and impacts of floods and earthquakes. Some of this data can also be used to model other hazards (for instance, the digital elevation model used in flooding). Tetra Tech will use the same analysis as flood control plan: Use the best available data and draw from that.

Sarah: Extra data for dam failure, do you need? (Will ask USACE)

> Rob: Yes, please send what you have.

Gail: Would like to specifically call out landslide risk in Shoreline, as WA State just announced program to fix some of the slopes on Amtrak line.

> Rob: Definitely will identify historical landslides and vulnerable infrastructure as best we can, but it's not the same as a 500 year flood plain or a shake map. Keep in mind too that although there is a county-wide risk identified in the plan, locals will also identify specific risks relevant to them.

PLAN REVIEW AND OBSERVATIONS

Discussion of what worked and what didn't from the 2009 King County RHMP

Dennis: Profile describes Seattle resources, but Seattle is not part of the RHMP.

> Rob: We need to make sure we're on the same page, but Seattle elected to write their own mitigation plan instead of having an annex in our plan. We will analyze every municipality even if

they aren't signed on with us. This will set us up to include more jurisdictions in future updates, and in the meantime give us a total view of risk across the county.

Sarah: Being in the process of taking the 2009 plan through council right now for adoption, the update really needs a very clear statement of what the mitigation plan is in language that's clear for those that are adopting it.

Rob: Chapter 1 is the "big picture" just for that reason, to make sure that everyone understands what mitigation is, so they understand what the plan is all about.

Rick Wallace: What really didn't work for me was to see something called "executive summary" but had to go four pages before seeing anything that looked results based. I would like to see more of the "why" and the "how" in the executive summary.

Bev: Part of the reason why that portion is so dense is so that FEMA can absorb what's in the entire plan by looking at the executive summary.

Rob: Executive summaries become handouts in many cases, so in addition to having all the key information, they do need to be clear and digestible.

Bob Freitag: Would like to spend more time on strategy rather than just risk. There should be a longer dialogue and time spent on this portion of the plan.

Rob: Will equip everyone with a tool kit so that jurisdiction reps can go back and talk to their engineers and planners ahead of time. Identify "shovel ready" projects that are queued up for when the funding becomes available.

Bob Freitag: All hazards have some benefits to some degree, this could be valuable to include in the discussion.

Bev: Valid point- if SC wants to take it to this level, it is possible to take this to a public outreach session as well.

Discussion of hazards from Washington State HMP

Part of the separation between natural and non-natural hazards is driven by King County developing a THIRA, which includes things like terrorism. However, a Hazard Mitigation Plan, according to FEMA, requires only natural hazards

Bev: Natural hazards will be addressed, be selective about including a few extra non-natural hazards.

Rick/Mike: Include cyber terrorism.

Rob: The hard part about including cyber terrorism is that you cannot define extent/exposure in the way that other hazards are analyzed. Can have other non-natural hazards linked to other things in the THIRA.

Rick: Would like to propose to the group that isolation be recognized as a hazard. Some areas of the community would suffer severe losses from isolation (losing ferry systems, etc.)

> Bev: Loss of ferries or isolation are defined as secondary impacts of the hazard, not a hazard in itself.

> Sarah: I think resolution will be found in discussion of the other hazards: tsunamis/earthquakes wreck ports/ferries, bridges, etc. Much of the effects like isolation will be identified through critical infrastructure.

> Rob: HAZUS will calculate the potential loss/shut down of critical facilities. We would also be remiss not to identify that King County has areas of potential isolation in the profile of the region.

Bob Freitag: In Everett's plan, much of the mitigation to prevent isolation was to simply mitigate the life lines that could break. In addition, Everett looked at adding functions of social capital like meeting places and community building to increase overall resilience on a local scale, so that potentially isolated communities could help each other.

CRITICAL FACILITIES

Due to lack of time, please review the critical facilities document before the April meeting. We will be crafting a formal definition at that time.

Bev: Take this out of the context of just police and fire- Think instead about what do you need to recover? It may not be a function of police/fire or other responders that often house emergency management programs.

Rob: Thinking broadly- Humboldt County considers campgrounds a critical facility, as they are the designated evacuation zones.

Review mission and vision statement document. Do we want to include this in the plan? We will revisit this at the next meeting.

PUBLIC OUTREACH (PHASE 1)

King County Hazard Mitigation Website will be the central point for public question/comment on the process

Tetra Tech is in the process of developing a public survey for outreach, as well as business card sized handouts for people to take with county website and the survey URLs.

As agreed, the committee will mirror King County's public comment policy at meetings. See below for details.

1.24.095 Rule 10: Public hearing and second reading.

A. At least seven days must elapse after introduction of a proposed ordinance, other than an emergency ordinance, before the council may conduct the required public hearing on the proposed ordinance. The council must conduct a public hearing before adopting an ordinance. Public testimony at the hearing must be germane to the proposed ordinance and must be made in such a manner as to comply with the requirements imposed by the chair under Rule 2.B, K.C.C. 1.24.015.B. The chair shall liberally construe this rule as it relates to public testimony.

B. The council shall allow general public comment on matters relating to county government at its meeting on the fourth Monday of each month, or the fourth Tuesday if the fourth Monday is a state or county holiday. General public comment is limited to fifteen minutes and each person making general public comment may speak for two minutes. General public comment may not be used for the purpose of assisting a campaign for election of any person to any office or for the promotion of or opposition to any ballot proposition. General public comment may not address any ordinance that is on that day's council agenda for public hearing. General public comment must be made in such a manner as to comply with the requirements imposed by the chair under Rule 2.B, K.C.C. 1.24.015.B. The chair shall liberally construe this rule as it relates to general public comment. (Ord. 17335 § 3, 2012: Ord. 16751 § 7, 2010: Ord. 15340 § 9, 2005: Ord. 13982 § 10, 2000: Ord. 11907 § 1, 1995: Ord. 11683 § 10, 1995).

PERMANENT MEETING SCHEDULE

Moving forward, meetings will be held on the third Tuesday, 1-3 pm.

SUMMARY AND CLOSURE

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM